REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 21, 2006 (hereinafter "the Office Action") having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 21, 2006.

Claims 1, 11, and 16-18 have been amended. Claims 15 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 21-27 had been withdrawn with traverse. Applicants hereby withdraw the traversal with respect to the restriction requirement prompting the election of Claims 1-20. Accordingly, Claims 21-27 are hereby withdrawn without traverse subject to the reservation of rights in the election.

Applicants have amended the Abstract to reflect Applicants' election.

The Drawings and disclosure were objected to due to informalities. Paragraphs **[0033]** and **[0034]** have been amended to address these informalities.

Claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants believe this rejection to be moot in view of the above mentioned amendments.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0266183 A1 ('Miller"). With this rejection, Applicants respectfully disagree, at least for the reasons set forth below.

In Miller, each of Figures 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 4, 5, 8, 11, and 14a-14d are cross-sectional views. Thus, in each of these views a vertical orientation of conductive lines is illustratively shown. Accordingly, while Miller shows conductive lines and associated vias narrower than the conductive lines, the spacing between conductive lines in the horizontal direction is not shown or described in Miller as that claimed in Applicants ' claims as indicated below.

In Miller, horizontal spacing of conductive lines is shown in the "overhead view" of Figure 3, which indicates substantially parallel conductive lines 320 but for a particle 330 defect which may cause an electrical short 360. (Miller at Figure 3 and paragraph [0038].) Notably, no taps are shown the overhead view of FIG. 3 of Miller.

Thus, Miller does not show or describe the feature claimed in amended claim 1 of a first wire tapered from the proximal end to the distal end of a horizontal surface.

Furthermore, for example, Miller does not show or describe the feature claimed in claim 1 of capacitors created between a first wire and a second wire with progressively reduced capacitive loads associated with the first wire taper.

With reference to amended claim 11, Miller does not show or describe the feature: a plurality of loads progressively reduced responsive to progressively reduced parasitic capacitance using a lengthwise tapered conductive wire selected from a group consisting of a tapered signal line and a tapered shielding line. Furthermore, for example, Miller does not show or describe the feature claimed in claim 11 of a tap of a plurality of taps located between a pair of loads of the plurality of loads.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Miller does not show or describe claims 1 and 11, and thus claims 1 and 11 should be allowed. Moreover, claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18 and 20, which depend upon an associated allowable base claim, likewise should be allowed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,679,088 ("Chiyoma"). With this rejection, Applicants respectfully disagree, at least for the reasons set forth below.

In Chiyoma, conductive strips include connecting conductive strips and capacitance adjustment strips. (Chiyoma, at Figure 3 and col. 3, line 66, to col. 4, line 34.) In Chiyoma, capacitance is adjusted by length of conductive strips and area of capacitance adjustment strips. (Id.) Even though Chiyoma indicates that distance between connecting conductive strips may vary from 100 microns to 1 millimeter, Chiyoma adjusts area of capacitance adjustment strips to length of conductive strips without mention of any parasitic capacitance effects.

When Chiyoma mentions "stray wiring capacitance," Chiyoma teaches away from varying gaps between respective adjacent conductive lines. Chiyoma states in relevant part that "...the same gap between adjacent strips is the same for all conductive strips 4, and because of this ground capacity C_1 and stray wiring capacitance C_2 of each of the conductive strips 4 are adjusted so that they are virtually equal." (Chiyoma at col. 5, lines 8-22.)

As indicated in the background section of Chiyoma, conductive lines of different

widths has been used to even "...out variations in wiring capacitance (C_1+ C_2)..." to adjust "...ground capacitance by changing conductive strips...so that their width decreases in proportion with their length." (Chiyoma at col. 2, lines 20-27.) However, this does not address variations in wiring stray capacitance as indicated in Chiyoma. (Chiyoma at col. 2, lines 28-34.) As indicated in Chiyoma, though conductive lines of different widths addresses ground capacity C_1, "...spaces between adjacent conductive strips are not equal..." and thus "...the wiring stray capacitance C_2 ...is non-uniform." (Id.) Thus, Chiyoma teaches away from this form of non-uniformity.

It is Applicant's position that Chiyoma does not show or describe the feature claimed in claims 1 and 11 of tapered lines. Rather, the non-uniformity introduced in Figure 14 of Chiyoma uses a plurality of lines in parallel of different widths, and not tapering width of a line as claimed in the instant application.

With reference to amended claims 1 and 11, it is Applicants' position that Chiyoma does not show or describe the feature: a plurality of loads progressively reduced responsive to progressively reduced parasitic capacitance using a lengthwise tapered conductive wire selected from a group consisting of a tapered signal line and a tapered shielding line. However, assuming arguendo that Chiyoma does disclose tapering of lines as claimed, even though it does not, Chiyoma discloses taps at the respective ends of conductive lines. Thus, Chiyoma does not show or describe the feature claimed in amended claims 1 and 11 of a tap of a plurality of taps located between a pair of loads of the plurality of loads.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Chiyoma does not show or describe claims 1 and 11, and thus claims 1 and 11 should be allowed. Moreover, claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18 and 20, which depend upon an associated allowable base claim, likewise should be allowed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All claims are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any questions, the Applicants' attorney can be reached at Tel: 408-879-6149.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael R. Hardaway
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 52,992

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on December 12, 2006.

Pat Tompkins
Name

Signature